



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/987,955	11/16/2001	Alok K. Saxena	12177/22701	7880

23838 7590 01/13/2005

KENYON & KENYON  
1500 K STREET, N.W., SUITE 700  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER
----------

TRAN, NGHI V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2151

DATE MAILED: 01/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Applicati n N .</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/987,955	SAXENA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Nghi V Tran	2151	

-- The MAILING DATE f this communication appears on the c ver sheet with the corresp ndence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 November 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 3, 11 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. Taking claim 3 as an exemplary claim, the functional limitation of the phrase "header compressor does not compress ... the header not transmitted with a payload" (emphasis added) renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the header, the header field, or the header compressor not transmitted with a payload.

5. Claims 11 and 19 are also rejected for the same reason set forth in claim 3 above.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jonsson et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,700,888 (hereinafter Jonsson).
8. Taking claim 1 as an exemplary claim, Jonsson teaches a call context processor (figure 1), comprising:
  - a header extractor (item 22 of figure 1) that extracts a header from information (item 28 of figure 1) extracted from initial call establishment negotiation (column 4, lines 5-19);
  - a header compressor (item 18 i.e. Header Compression Node) that compresses relevant portions of the extracted header (column 4, lines 1-4 and column 4, lines 21-39); and
  - an identification module that establishes context identification using the compressed relevant portions of the header (column 1, lines 58 through column 2, line 25).
9. Claims 9 and 17 are also rejected for the same reason set forth in claim 1 above.

Art Unit: 2151

10. Taking claim 5 as an exemplary claim, Jonsson further teaches the header being an RTP, UDP, IP header (column 1, lines 13-34).

11. Claims 13 and 21 are also rejected for the same reason set forth in claim 5 above.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 2-4, 10-12, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jonsson et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,700,888 (hereinafter Jonsson) as applied in claims 1, 9, and 17 above, and further in view of Stumpert, U.S. Patent Number 6,832,088.

14. Taking claim 2 as an exemplary claim, Jonsson teaches the identification module associates the context identification. However, Jonsson fails to teach the identification module associates the context identification with a bearer channel of a call established from the initial call establishment negotiation.

In a wireless communication system, Stumpert discloses the identification module associates the context identification with a bearer channel of a call established from the initial call establishment negotiation (column 3, lines 23-35; column 3, line 60 - column 4, line 3 i.e. bearer channel control signal is not available in the IP network. Therefore, gateway performs bearer conversion of signaling messages between web servers and mobile station or mobile phone).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Jonsson in view of Stumpert by associating the context identification with a bearer channel because this feature enables the telecommunication network to perform an optimal routing using minimum of resources (column 2, lines 44-49). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to modify Jonsson in view of Stumpert in order to "control the selection of a path through the transmission network and utilizing the required resource" (column 1, lines 17-29).

15. Claims 10 and 18 are also rejected for the same reason set forth in claim 2 above.

16. Taking claim 3 as an exemplary claim, Jonsson teaches the header compressor does not compress header fields of the header (column 4, lines 1-4; item 13 of figure 1; figure 2 i.e. Violation Node does not compress header fields of the header). However, Jonsson fails to teach the header field not transmitted with a payload.

In a wireless communication system, Stumpert discloses the header fields not transmitted with a payload (column 2, lines 39-50).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Jonsson in view of Stumpert by not transmitting the header fields with a payload because this feature saves bandwidth. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to modify Jonsson in view of Stumpert in order to "enable the telecommunication network to perform an optimal routing for the payload, using a minimum of resources" (column 2, lines 45-47).

17. Claims 11 and 19 are also rejected for the same reason set forth in claim 3 above.

18. Taking claim 4 as an exemplary claim, Jonsson teaches the header compressor (item 18 of figure 1 i.e. HCN). However, Jonsoon fails to teach the head compressor compress only a payload type.

In a wireless communication system, Stumpert discloses the header compressor compresses only a payload type header field (column 2, lines 63-66).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Jonsson in view of Stumpert by compressing only a payload type because this feature increases the bandwidth. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been

Art Unit: 2151

motivated to modify Jonsson in view of Stumpert in order to save transmission capacity throughout the network without any additional bandwidth (column 2, lines 65-66).

19. Claims 12 and 20 are also rejected for the same reason set forth in claim 4 above.

20. Claims 6, 14-16, and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jonsson et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,700,888 (hereinafter Jonsson) as applied in claims 1, 9, and 17 above, and further in view of Mei et al., "Turning an HTTP proxy server into a wireless Internet gateway" (hereinafter Mei).

21. Taking claim 6 as an exemplary claim, Jonsson fails to teach the call context processor extracts information by processing a create connection message and an associated session data protocol header from the initial call establishment negotiation.

In a wireless communication system, Mei discloses the call context processor (figure 2 i.e. WAP gateway) extracts information by processing a create connection message and an associated session data protocol header from the initial call establishment negotiation (page 5 of 14).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Jonsson in view of Mei by processing a create connection message and an associated session data protocol head from initial call establishment negotiation because this feature "allows the client systems to access



Art Unit: 2151

Internet via a different protocol” (page 4 of 14). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to modify Jonsson in view of Mei in order “to reduce the amount of data that must be transmitted over the air interface” (page 1 of 14).

22. Claims 16 and 24 are also rejected for the same reason set forth in claim 6 above.

23. Taking claim 14 as an exemplary claim, Jonsson fails to teach extracting information from initial call establishment negotiation, and establishing the context identification are performed at a base of a transmission network.

In a wireless communication system, Mei discloses extracting information from initial call establishment negotiation, and establishing the context identification are performed at a base of a transmission network (pages 5-7).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Jonsson in view of Mei by extracting information from initial call establishment negotiation and establishing the context identification at a base of a transmission network because this feature “allows the wireless client systems to access Internet via a different protocol” (page 4 of 14). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to modify Jonsson in view of Mei in order “to reduce the amount of data that must be transmitted over the air interface” (page 1 of 14).

24. Claim 22 is also rejected for the same reason set forth in claim 14 above.

25. Taking claim 15 as an exemplary claim, Jonsson fails to teach a remote unit accesses the base via airlink.

In a wireless communication system, Mei discloses a remote unit accesses the base via airlink (figure 2 i.e. WAP domain including client system which is cell phone using WSP).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Jonsson in view of Mei by accessing a remote unit through the base using airlink because this feature "allows the wireless client systems to access Internet via a different protocol" (page 4 of 14). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to modify Jonsson in view of Mei in order "to reduce the amount of data that must be transmitted over the air interface" (page 1 of 14).

26. Claim 23 is also rejected for the same reason set forth in claim 15 above.

27. Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ton et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,745,012 (hereinafter Ton) in view of Jonsson et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,700,888 (hereinafter Jonsson).

Art Unit: 2151

28. With respect to claim 7, Ton teaches a transmission network (figure 1), comprising: a network (items 16 and 24 of figure 1); and a base (item 20 of figure 1) connected to the network that includes a call context processor (item 14 of figure 1). However, Ton fails to teach the call context processor comprising: a header extractor that extracts a header from information extracted from initial call establishment negotiation; a header compressor that compresses relevant portions of the extracted header; and an identification module that establishes context identification using the compressed relevant portions of the header.

In a wireless communication system, Jonsson discloses a call context processor comprising: a header extractor that extracts a header from information extracted from initial call establishment negotiation; a header compressor that compresses relevant portions of the extracted header; and an identification module that establishes context identification using the compressed relevant portions of the header. However, Jonsson is silent on a network and a base connected to the network that include a call context processor.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Ton in view of Jonsson because this feature saves bandwidth. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to modify Ton in view of Jonsson in order to reduce the amount of data.

Art Unit: 2151

29. With respect to claim 8, Ton further teaches the base transfers data to a remote unit (item 26 of figure 1) via airlink access (item 24 of figure 1).

### ***Conclusion***

30. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. "Robust header compression in a packet communications," by Jonsson et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,754,231.

b. "Header compression in real time service," by Hamiti et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,751,209.

c. "System and method for the compression of proprietary encapsulations," by Scarmalis, U.S. Patent Number 6,229,823.

d. "Method and system for optimizing usage of air link," by Leppinen, U.S. Patent Number 6,735,186.

e. "Update of header compression state in packet communications," by Svanbro et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,556,587.

f. "Connectionless media transmission without bear-channel control signaling," by Siddiqui et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,826,176.

31. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nghi V Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-4067. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

Art Unit: 2151

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on (571) 272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nghi V Tran  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2151

NT

  
**ZARNI MAUNG**  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER